



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/712,685	11/13/2003	Evgeniya Freydina	2003P86278US	9109
37462	7590	06/22/2010		
LANDO & ANASTASI, LLP ONE MAIN STREET, SUITE 1100 CAMBRIDGE, MA 02142				
EXAMINER				
DRODGE, JOSEPH W				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1797				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/22/2010		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@LAIaw.com

gengelso@LAIaw.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/712,685

Applicant(s)

FREYDINA ET AL.

Examiner

Joseph W. Drodge

Art Unit

1797

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 May 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-7,10,11,13-20,22 and 28-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-7,10,11,13-20,22 and 28-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(e) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

** Throughout below office action 103 rejections, "c" denotes referenced patent column, "l" denotes line number of the column, and "p" denotes referenced paragraph of PGPUBS locations.

Claims 1,3-7,10,11,13-20,22 and 28-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liang et al 7,572,359 in view of Batchelder et al patent 6,126,805, and if necessary in view of Stoddard patent 2,912,372 and/or Liang et al patent 5,292,422. For independent claims 1 and 11, Liang discloses introducing 1st portions of water from point of entry to vessel(s), reservoir(s) and/or surge tanks, while other portions of water are introduced in series or parallel flow into an electrochemical device, notably an electrodeionization (EDI) device [as in claim 10], for removal of undesirable (especially hardness-causing) species/impurities, the vessel(s), reservoir(s) and/or surge tanks storing water and distributing water therefrom to points of use in a household or alternatively to an industrial point of use. See especially c 4, l 23-52 re point of entry, c 4, l 52-64 and c 12, l 5-16 re system distribution and vessel storage and c 7, l 43-59 re EDI operation. An electric current and electric field is applied either uniformly or non-uniformly for which the polarity may occasionally be reversed (c 7, l 47-67). For independent claim 17, applying of electric current implies a power supply, and applying non-uniformly or as a gradient, implies control/controller (c 7, l 47-67). For claim 22, c 4, l 40-52 also discloses household distribution system with 'spigot', hence inferring at least kitchen sink faucet.

With regard to the limitations newly added to independent claims 1,11 and 17, Liang discloses the "pressure vessel", as encompassing the electrochemical treatment device(s) and a plurality of reservoirs, surge tanks and flow control elements within the pressure vessel and devices therein (column 4, lines 53-60), the flow control elements described as optionally containing baffles (column 8, lines 30-53). Therefor, the baffles within the device(s) and other structures within the pressure vessel would define a plurality also of fluid storage zones.

The claims all differ in requiring that the electrical current is maintained so as to be below a limiting current density or to suppress hydroxyl ion generation, or alternately, so as to promote removal of undesired species from the water. Batchelder teaches that EDI-containing water treatment systems are operated near or below the limiting current density, sometimes in combination with reversal of direction of the electric current (as in Batchelder) in order to mitigate the precipitation and deposition of minerals to contact surfaces (column 1, line 62-column 2, line 19 and column 4, line 42-column 5, line 2, etc.) Such actions are taught as reducing “water splitting” or formation of hydroxyl ions. More specifically, in column 8, lines 34-47 and column 12, lines 35-38 and 45-51, Batchelder explicitly teaches operating the anion exchange membranes of an electrodialysis or electrodeionizing device to have a reduced water-splitting capacity and to operate the cation exchange membranes of such device to have a relatively limited water-splitting capacity compared to enhanced water splitting membranes, with such objectives realized by limiting current densities [as required by claim 3].

Thus, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have controlled the EDI process in the Liang et al system by operating near or below the limiting current density to minimize water splitting, or formation of hydroxyl ions, as taught by Batchelder, to further limit the amount of precipitation occurring on the EDI surfaces and downstream of the device especially in the concentrating stream, so as to optimize the EDI operation in removal of salts and other contaminants.

If necessary, Liang ‘422 teaches in embodiment of figure 5, to use an EDI unit for domestic appliances such as replacing or in conjunction with home water softeners and thus on to household distribution points, in a system also employing diverted flow to

Art Unit: 1797

tank/reservoir/vessel 180 and recirculation (c 10, l 38- c 11, l 18). Also if necessary, Stoddard explicitly teaches water treatment through an electrochemical, softening unit to provide water to household appliances such as dishwashers (c 1, l 25-35 with c 5, l 51-c 6, l 47).

Liang '359 also discloses the following for dependent claims: measuring, monitoring and adjusting of water properties & parameters for claims 4-7, 13-16, 19, 20, 28 and 30-32 (c 4, l 60-62 and c 13, l 15-40), water distribution for claim 6, 18 and 15 (c 4 and c 12), flow rate adjustment for claims 7 and 16 (c 4, l 60-61), storing of treated and untreated water in pressurized reservoir system for claims 8, 12, 29, 30 and 9 (c 4, l 60-61), the parallel/serial arrangement providing mixing of treated and untreated water for claim 27.

Applicant's arguments with respect to rejection of the claims based on Liang '422 and Willman as primary references are persuasive and rejections based on such have been withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments filed on 4/7/2010, with regard to rejection of the claims based on Liang '359 as primary reference have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. It is argued that Liang '359 does not disclose the newly added limitations regarding baffles or tank/reservoir zones. The disclosure of Liang concerning such limitations is herein reproduced:

With regard to the limitations newly added to independent claims 1, 11 and 17, Liang discloses the "pressure vessel", as encompassing the electrochemical treatment device(s) and a plurality of reservoirs, surge tanks and flow control elements within the pressure vessel and devices therein (column 4, lines 53-60), the flow control elements described as optionally containing baffles (column 8, lines 30-53). Therefor, the baffles within the device(s) and other structures within the pressure vessel would define a plurality also of fluid storage zones.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph Drodge at telephone number 571-272-1140. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Duane Smith, can be reached at 571-272-1166.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR, and through Private PAIR only for unpublished applications. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have any questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/712,685

Page 7

Art Unit: 1797

JWD

6/17/2010

/Joseph W. Drodge/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1797